
AUTOMATED MESSAGE: This meeting is now being recorded.

BRENDA BREWER: Good day everyone. This is Brenda Brewer for the record. I'd like to --
[AUDIO BREAK]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: You're coming in and out, Brenda. [AUDIO BREAK]

Anybody else?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, I will step in. It seems like Brenda lost audio, so. Welcome everyone. This is the Plenary Call for the RDS WHOIS2 review team, plenary call number 18 on 5th of February 2018 at 2:30 pm UTC. Today in attendance we have Susan Kawaguchi, Lili Sun, Cathrin Bauer-Bulst, Carlton Samuels.

For ICANN Org, we have Alice Jansen, Amy Creamer, Lisa Phifer, Brenda Brewer, and myself, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez. In the observer room, we have nobody so far, and we have apologies today from [inaudible] and Alan Greenberg.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thank you, Jean-Baptiste and Brenda. Let me start with the right process here. Are there any SOISA that people would like to declare?

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Doesn't sound like there is, so even though we only have a few members on the call, I'd like to go ahead and continue the call because we have work to be done. Thank you for joining this morning.

It looks like what we should start with is the sub-group status, and I'll start first to get it rolling. The compliance sub-group now had a meeting with the call. I was in ICANN offices last week, but we also had ability for the other members to call in and dial in to the meeting.

We had a meeting with Maguy Serad and Jamie Hedlund, and it was just another kick off meeting to figure out how ICANN Compliance was structured, who works on WHOIS, what tools they're using, what interaction with other groups out there, formal groups that deal with WHOIS, like the APWG and some other abuse groups, and it was actually a very informative meeting, and I sent out the document that Maguy prepared from our questions.

What the compliance sub-group will be doing now is taking that document and making a plan for the next steps. I haven't done that because that was last Thursday and it was a little crazy that last week. So, I'll propose a plan for the compliance sub group.

Also, they've recently published the compliance annual report for 2017. So, the homework for the compliance subgroup is to read that, and hopefully before Friday, we'll have a better idea of where we're going and how we are going to review WHOIS and Compliance, so we're on our way with it. Any questions or concerns with that?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hi, this is Cathrin. Sorry, I'm not in the Adobe room. I was just wondering how you went about the meeting? Did you [inaudible] sort of good practice that you could share? Did you share? Because I know you also had a number of questions formulated in your subgroup one first priority work statement and work plan. Did you send those [inaudible], or did you have any preparation in terms of sharing any other documents or questions beforehand?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes. We took the overall questions from the template document and created more specific questions, added details we wanted, but it still was sort of a document that was just overall, like how does ICANN manage WHOIS. Actually, Carlton added some really interesting questions. He was the one that added the questions to the working document that we provided to them in advance about what relationships they have with other abuse groups, APWG and just groups in general.

That actually was an interesting discussion. It sort of sits outside of compliance with David Conrad's team, but I think it will give us an interesting area of exploration and probably something more to delve into that I hadn't really seen, so I appreciate that, Carlton.

But I think we had a list of maybe 10 or 15 questions, which was helpful to them also because they weren't thinking on the fly, and Maguy prepared a responsive document, which in the discussion, we were able to ask additional questions off of that document, so go a little more in depth. So I would recommend that with whomever your team has

targeted to talk to at ICANN, that you provide some of the questions up front. It just gives a more in depth conversation.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, thank you. We have the strategic priority subgroup that I'm the rapporteur for, and for this one, I have a number of pretty detailed questions in the document that will now be taken up in the additional briefing request.

So what I was wondering, in fact, was whether to wait for this briefing and then go back for more detail, or whether to sort of have a meeting first, possibly even, even though the briefings I understand are still being prepared.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I would suggest that you start a dialog, because even though the briefing documents may be really helpful once we see them, they're going to be several weeks out, or months out, and so if you actually start a dialogue with the team -- and I'm not sure, having not looked at the strategic priority template, I'm not sure which teams at ICANN that would be, but I just found it very enlightening just to talk to them.

We scheduled an hour, we went like an hour and 20 minutes, and it probably could have gone much longer, but people had other things to attend to, but even if you just scheduled a half hour call, you might discover details that you want to dig into more that you haven't really thought of. Which is definitely what came out of our experience.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Okay, excellent. Thank you for that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Since you're on the line, do you want to give us an update on strategic priorities, because we need to just go through all these sub groups.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sure, so I have Strategic Priorities. We have sign ups from Carlton, who have me some edits to the document, and is happy with the overall outcome now, and we're still waiting feedback from Volker.

So, as he was on parental leave, and I understand he was sick afterwards, he hasn't yet reacted, and I was hoping that that would get closed down within the week, and then we have some pretty specific questions which independently of his approval, we've already set into the briefings request now a couple weeks back, so that should be on its way.

But now indeed another consideration would be whether instead of waiting for that, we go for a meeting right away to sort of get things moving a bit faster. That's where we stand right now on the strategic priorities.

And on the law enforcement needs, I saw that there was discussion last time that the sub groups for which Thomas Walden is the rapporteur, which I'm also on, and here the questions that have been formulated in the first pass document are much more general because that's also one of the areas where we were struggling with the moving context.

And here, I think I come back to here, not much has happened here in the last few weeks, and I think here we need to see whether we just take the WHOIS as it was or whether we take whichever version is announced on February 12th or whenever they will do it, and see how that measures up. And then take it from there.

What worked well for the first report we've already started doing for the EU context, is to evaluate how it meets the needs for law enforcement. So, also in the context of the new development of the interim model, we have done the survey together with Europol of the member states law enforcement agencies to see how they work with the current WHOIS, what are their challenges and what are the data [inaudible] that they require, and what else is needed that we can build on to now evaluate whether the WHOIS serves its purpose from a law enforcement perspective, and we would then have to extend that to a wider audience.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

That makes sense, but I'm wondering, February 12th is coming up fast, but even before that, if you could make that evaluation -- well, you have with asking the briefing questions, but if you started that dialogue with ICANN on how it exists right now and then extend it to the GDPR Compliance model or the Interim model after, because I do think we still need to look back on what has happened in the last six years since the last review team report and have things changed in that time period to make things better or worse for law enforcement. Sometimes I wonder if it's gotten worse.

So again on the law enforcement, I would flesh that document. I did take a look at that document when we were talking about maybe putting it up today, but I think it needs more detailed questions and a roadmap, and I reached out to Thomas and he's just been -- had family issues, then work issues that have kept him too busy, but I think that if the document had a little more detail, it would help your plan moving forward. Lisa, you have your hand up.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Definitely, I think there you're right. In doing the evaluations for [inaudible] adjustments, we did talk to European law enforcements about the concerns that they have with the current WHOIS, so we have a fair idea of how things have evolved since 2013, 2014, and we did hear a lot of issues in particular that surround two aspects.

First of all, the increasing use of privacy proxy services, and even more inaccurate information in the general WHOIS where privacy proxy services are not used. And then secondly, the challenge that arrives is from the fact that there's many registries that are not subject to WHOIS requirements, notably for the ccTLDs who also have an enormous market share and who have imposed very different conditions, and that problem has grown larger for law enforcement over the years.

But those are the two main aspects that we have come across and we need to flesh that out further and we also need to take it beyond the EU because what we did now was just incorporation with our usual. We asked the European Commission in cooperation with our usual suspects.

So that indeed we would need to flesh out and we could add some of the questions that we [inaudible] on the European contact [inaudible] also to the standard documents. They do exist and we could expand that also almost independently, or Thomas, depending on how available he is.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Yeah, that would be a good idea [inaudible] because the questions that you are asking EU Law enforcement have got to apply for the most part, they're general questions, to any law enforcement around the world.

I also think that if you could add those questions to the template, that would help Thomas move the document forward. Obviously, you're moving it forward, but it might spark some other questions for him and his own experience with law enforcement. So, that would be great, if you could drop those questions into the template and then share it with the subgroup again.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Alright, will do.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Thanks Cathrin, and Lisa, you had your hand up.

LISA PHIFER:

Yes I do, thanks Susan. Lisa Phifer for the transcript. So, I think we need to be a little bit more clear also about when investigation might be

happening outside this review team versus any surveying that the review team itself might do because of course, activities that the review team or the subgroup has within the review team really need to happen within the subgroup list and with enough formalized plan so that the whole community can be clear about what activities are taking place and participate in calls if calls are scheduled, etc.

To that end, if there is to be a survey of law enforcement agencies, we really need that spelled out in the document a little bit more clearly and what the review team itself will undertake versus what you might need a third party to assist you with on surveys. So Cathrin, maybe you could give a little thought to any actual surveys that you'll actually need outside support for, we'll have to begin the process of evaluating what resources you need to conduct a broader survey and get those lined up.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST:

Sure, I'll consider that. I have to say from my experience, we'll probably do it ourselves. We use surveys a lot and we run them ourselves using our tools. So, I'm still hoping that we can stick to the 'no need for a third party contract' approach.

Can you still hear me? Somebody told me the host has left the meeting. Yes, but Lisa, I totally understand and I will make that very clear, and of course, if we run a globalized survey, we will run all the questions and everything through all the process. So, what I did now was based on some other hats that I wear.

LISA PHIFER: Right, exactly. So I think especially for those listening to this call and following the review team's activities, we just need to make it clear, and if I understand, the European Commission is what you mean by ourselves.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Yes, in this case it was the European Commission and Europol. One of the agencies.

LISA PHIFER: Great, then the review team may need to make the proposal that that be the organization that runs the survey on the broader basis and get buy in from the review team itself.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: The tool that we use is publicly available to anyone, but we can make it clear that it was originally funded by the European Commission. And of course, I will add it to the document and run it through the procedures that you now mentioned.

LISA PHIFER: Thank you. That's great.

SUSAN KAWAGUICHI: This is Susan Kawaguchi for the record. Lisa, I know staff also has availability of a survey tool, so they could also help out with that survey,

couldn't they? Or is the tool -- Cathrin, the tool you're talking about, is that specific to law enforcement?

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: No, it's called EU Survey. It's a general surveying tool that has some easy [inaudible] capabilities, so you can download in different [inaudible], you can do some mathematic data processing. But it's nothing particularly special, so if there's other tools that would be just as convenient, that would be perfectly fine. I was just thinking there's probably no need to get a full contract with a third party to run the survey.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right, no; I would agree with that. So, that would be great, if you could start compiling a list of questions for the survey for your sub group to review and add to. To me, that would be a big step forward.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sure.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, and Lisa, your hand is up?

LISA PHIFER: It is. Thanks, new hand. A follow up point which is just that I think from the perspective of the review team planning it's work outlining the questions that you think might need to be covered by a survey and the

parameters of any tool that would be used that it would have global reach, be accessible to everyone who might need to participate, how you would get the list of survey participants; those kinds of things in terms of planning would be very helpful.

And then, Cathrin, absolutely, if you have a tool in place that meets those parameters, then I'm sure the team would want to leverage off of it, but getting the parameters spelled out clearly, I think would be a huge help in moving this forward.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Excellent. This is Cathrin again for the record. With all this encouragement, I'll try and take this forward.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Cathrin. I think that was a good discussion to maybe also help some of the other teams think about how to move things forward. So, if there's no other discussion on the LE, can we go to the single WHOIS policy with Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Hi Susan. It's Carlton. I don't have any further update from last Friday. OE did the first pass document. Cathrin responded and added some clarifications and things to it. Volker is our other team member, and he's been away for a while with some personal issues, so we're expecting Volker to get back in play right this week. So, once we get that locked down, we start.

I have started looking at some of the documentation that's available on the policy. While we can do some other things, I think that in my view, and I have not yet discussed it with the team, but I think the option that emerges from the current consultations and responding to the GDPR requirement may actually be seen as a policy, even a permanent temperate policy position, and to my mind, it would be probable the first time that you have a coherent policy position from ICANN org.

The party as Working Group 2 in a very short while may issue an interim report that will tease out in the traditional policy making direction what they're suggesting for policy for WHOIS. So we do have some things coming along that will be very helpful in teasing all the landscape for WHOIS policy. So, we're just working with that, thanks.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Thanks, Carlton.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Hi, this is Cathrin. Sorry.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Oh, go ahead. Go ahead, Cathrin.

CATHRIN BAUER-BULST: Sorry, Susan. Just really quickly. I have to drop off because I have a parent-teacher conference, I will hopefully join later, or else, I'll speak to you on the next call. Sorry about that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Thanks for letting us know. Okay, Cathrin. Have a good day, or evening for you. Whatever it is. So, I'm sure you've noticed this, Carlton, but Goran repeatedly, on several instances at least, three at least that I've noted, has stated how helpful it would be to have a single WHOIS policy.

So, that might be interesting to quote that since all of this is transcribed, in your report, because if the CEO is calling for a single WHOIS policy, I think the whole community is too, but you know.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes. You're quite right, Susan. We were very -- well, I personally am hopeful because he keeps on calling. That is why the options that he put out for community response is so interesting to me because that would be a good indicator of what a coherent WHOIS policy is that he's talking about, so I'm looking forward to the dust settling there and we have an option that people are willing to call us around and see what happens.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right, okay. Well, thank you and if there's something that the whole review team could help you with to move things forward, then let us know, because at the end of the day, this is everybody's work on the review team.

Lili, data accuracy, do you have an update?

LILI SUN: Yes. This is Lili for the record. I'm sorry I was absent for the last Plenary call on Friday. And [inaudible], I received one from the [inaudible] subgroup, and I already updated the [inaudible] documents according to this. The planning is not to have the updates send it all to [inaudible].

However, the list of this subgroup, only Cathrin, Dmitri and myself [inaudible], so I'm planning to draft the funding by myself, [inaudible] Cathrin and Dmitri about their opinion, and also in the first draft document [inaudible] we may need an interview with WHOIS accuracy suggestions and also the -- [AUDIO BREAK]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Did we lose you, Lili?

LILI SUN: -- and also ICANN's contract to compliance team. So I will go through the document you shared during the mailing list about the compliance team [inaudible] to the questionnaires to find if there is anything we need in the document. I may leave a questionnaire to the compliance team later. This is for the work plan for this subgroup. Sorry, during the [inaudible] last week privately, they didn't have no further updates about this subgroup.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thank you. And you might also -- [inaudible] to the whole review team, but since compliance published their annual report, you might

find something in that document too that would guide your review of the data accuracy.

LILI SUN: You mean the annual report from the compliance team?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes.

LILI SUN: Okay, sure; we'll do that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Maybe staff can send that to the whole review team going to that. Then, Lisa, your hand is up.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Susan. Lisa Phifer for the transcript. Lili, I know in the area of data accuracy, there are quarterly reports that are published about the results coming from the Rs of the accuracy reporting system.

I'm wondering whether all of the team members in this subgroup are looking at all of the material that has been collected for data accuracy or whether you plan to divide amongst yourselves the documents and webinars and supporting material to help go through everything that is available to you and decide whether you need additional information.

So Lili, you're up again, because Volker and Dmitri are not on the line, how about on WHOIS rep '15, '16 plan and annual report?

LILI SUN: For this subgroup, we [inaudible] on the work plan. We will defer the drafting for the draft reports until we have some [inaudible] conclusions from other sub groups.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, is there anything else that we could help you with to move that forward?

LILI SUN: I would appreciate if any subgroups who want to finish [inaudible] reports could share some copies with me.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, we can take a look at that. Alright, is there anybody on the call that's on these other sub groups that could speak to them? I'm just looking through them. I'm actually on consumer trust. I know we've finalized the document but we haven't taken any steps forward, and I'll take a look at that today.

CARLTON SAMUELS Susan, I'm also on the consumer trust subgroup. I've seen the document and the listing needs to be updated, but I've seen the

document, I know we've [inaudible] something, but nothing much has changed since the last time Erika put it out.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

Right. I do know there was a back and forth. Alan reviewed it and thought that a couple of the questions were either too broad, or didn't pertain and Erika was going to remove those. So, I'll take another look at that and see if we can develop a plan to the next step.

The privacy proxy, I'm not listed on that, but I did do the initial template. We'll take another look at that and see if there's something that I can develop a plan and move that forward.

It's pretty clear what's going on with privacy proxy right now. We won't know what's going on with privacy proxy after February 12th, probably, but taking a look back, a lot has been worked on, just nothing implemented yet. Anybody else want to comment? I'm sorry. Go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

This is Carlton. Sorry, Susan. In respect to privacy proxy, there's an IRT going on right now with privacy proxy and a lot of decisions were taken. That might be useful in reporting as a possible looking back effort. Most of those things have not been implement yet of course, but it will be useful and [inaudible].

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right. Okay, and then I realized I'm on common interface too, and I haven't done anything on that. That was on my to-do list and I didn't do it, so hopefully by Friday, we'll have something a little more detailed.

Right. Any other comments on the subgroups? Looks like we don't. So, the roadmap, the face to face meeting. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa. Just one quick reminder to everyone, I guess, which is that after your work plan document is completed, we'll need to move quickly into those next steps and that includes if you have questions that you need to have a briefing for, as Susan did with the compliance team. You'll need to develop those questions so they can be shared with subject matter experts that may then provide you with that briefing.

Similarly, if you think you may have a study that you may need to conduct, you'll need to identify that as quickly as you can, because putting together any study that involves outside help does require additional time.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's a good reminder, and actually, all of these questions are very critical on this slide, so I would recommend everybody working on subgroups to take these questions and think about them, and provide answers to your subgroup on each of these. I think this would be a good structure for that next step of planning and scheduling of briefings if we need it or actual interviews.

I would really stress, the conversation I had with compliance, to me was really really helpful, so I think actually getting on a phone call is really critical because just a lot of nuanced details came out of that call. So, I'm not sure what we plan -- so this [inaudible] is the roadmap.

We have our face to face meeting planned starting April 16th, but we need quite a bit of information from each of the subgroups to discuss at that meeting, so we have a little over two months to put that all together to gather all the information and put it into some sort of working document so that the rest of the review team can review it and we can discuss it at the face to face meeting. So, I encourage everyone to make that next step and actually start your review.

Lisa, was there anything else you wanted to add on the roadmap to the face to face meeting?

LISA PHIFER:

Not at this time. It might be helpful, Susan, if we have a target for each of the sub groups coming back with some answers to some of these questions. I don't know if an appropriate target would be the next plenary meeting or the one after that, but I think that if we don't have answers to these questions very soon, it will be very difficult to actually complete the work for the face to face meeting.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

That makes sense. So our next plenary meeting is Friday, right? Correct?

LISA PHIFER: Correct, this Friday.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And then, when is the following one? Because last week we decided to change the meeting schedule a little bit, right?

LISA PHIFER: Right, I believe, and Brenda correct me if I'm wrong, that the next meeting would be Monday the 19th of February?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, that is correct. The 19th of February.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, let's make that our target, that all of the subgroups come back with answers to these questions, come back with a plan, and hopefully the 19th isn't pushing it too much for staff to help with these, but if you can come back earlier with the answers to these questions, that would be great, but if by the 19th for sure your subgroups have reviewed these questions and provided thought and consideration on what you need, that would be very helpful to our review. Good idea, Lisa. And Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks. Whoever is controlling the slide deck, maybe if you could advance one more slide. So, this is the timeline that's currently reflected in the work plan for the next phase and having complete the

work planning phase, we're now in the work plan execution phase, and although there is no heading on this little snippet of the work plan, the first column is the start date, the first date column, the second date column is the end date, and then the sub group responsible, the number of days between start and end and the percentage complete.

So as you can see in the current work plan, we are actually aiming to complete work plan execution by the 22nd of February, which may be optimistic right now, but that just gives us an idea of the timeline that would have been necessary to get us to the level of completion for a face to face meeting that we're aiming for, so we do really need to dig in and begin work plan execution, not just planning, but actually doing the review and analysis having our briefing sessions, if those are needed and beginning to draft your findings.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI:

So could we maybe add that to an email to go out to the whole team, along with the questions from the previous flag and then work plan execution? Because I think seeing this information is really helpful. Okay, anybody else have any comments on the work plan execution?
[AUDIO BREAK]

Alright, and on the face to face meeting, you should be receiving requests from ICANN travel to set up all your airline details. So that should be coming soon. Alice or Jean-Baptiste, do we know when that'll happen?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Hi Susan. Yes, there was a request to submit after the last plenary call, and you should be receiving some information this week.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, perfect. So if everybody could respond to that fairly quickly. Did we have a slide on ICANN? We've already talked about the law enforcement subgroups, so I'm just going through the agenda here. Did we have a slide for ICANN62?

ALICE JANSEN: Susan, this is Alice. Before we move on to ICANN62, could we review the membership of the subgroups? It's on the agenda for the --

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. Sorry, I missed that. Yes we can, if you give me some hints on that.

ALICE JANSEN: Lisa, I'm probably going to ask you to lead this one.

LISA PHIFER: This is Lisa. I'm sorry, are we talking about ICANN62?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: The subgroup membership. And I am just not -- I'm for a loss what we -- I remember that going on the agenda but not why. So I need help.

LISA PHIFER:

Yeah, sure. Sorry, I heard you jump forward and then jump back, and I got lost in the thread. One of the reasons for reviewing this slide was both to reconfirm WHOIS on each subgroup, but also to determine whether any adjustments were needed.

In some cases, we may have rapporteurs that do not have time to work on this as much as they might like at this point so the question would be does someone else on the subgroup want to either temporarily or permanently step up to assist with pushing the ball ahead and do we have enough resources on each subgroup or do we need to add any.

I believe that Alan had done an assessment of the number of subgroup members recommended by each of the groups in their work plan compared to the number of members that were assigned and found that every subgroup seemed to have the targeted number of members, so perhaps no additional resources would be needed, but of course in this chart that's displayed, you can see strategic priority is Carlton, Cathrin and Volker with Cathrin leading.

The single WHOIS policy is Carlton. Cathrin and Thomas with Carlton leading. Carlton gave a read out on that today. The outreach is Alan, Erika, and Carlton with Alan leading and Alan is not here today to give a read out on that. I believe he gave a read out of it on the Friday call. The merged compliance group, Susan has already spoken to. But that's Carlton, Chris, Erika, Susan and Thomas, so obviously we have more members here, but that is because both the subgroup identified a need

for more members and we've merged evaluation of recommendation for with the additional objective for compliance.

Accuracy, Lili gave us a read out today, but that's Cathrin, Dmitri, and Lili, with Lili on the lead. Privacy Proxy, Susan, I believe you've pushed that ahead on Volker's parental leave, but that's Cathrin, Stephanie, Volker, and Susan assisting. Susan, I know you reached out to Volker to determine whether he'd caught up on that yet, but clearly this is one area that we need to get busy on.

Moving ahead, common interface is Alan, Susan and Volker, again with Volker in the lead, and Susan I believe this is one where actually the first draft work plan document hasn't even really begun, so this is an area that needs to be worked on soon.

IDN is Alan, Dmitri, Lili, with Dmitri in the lead. And as Dmitri reported his regrets for the meeting this morning, he indicated that he'd give a read out on that in our next Plenary call. Annual reports is Alan, Chris, Lili, with Lili in the lead. Anything new, which is changes to policy and procedures around RDS since the first review team complete, that would be Alan, Stephanie, and Susan with Stephanie in the lead. Law enforcement, Cathrin spoke to today, but that's Cathrin, Chris, and Thomas, with Thomas in the lead.

Consumer Trust is Dmitri, Erika, Stephanie and Susan with Erika in the lead. I know Carlton expressed some interest in joining that one. Carlton, perhaps you need to touch base with Erika to reconfirm whether you want to be on that subgroup as well. And then

safeguarding registrant data is Alan, Dmitri, Stephanie and Volker, with Alan in the lead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Susan, this is Carlton. I did get to Erika and she agreed for me to join the group. The email was sent several weeks ago. It's just not caught up with the documentation. [AUDIO BREAK]

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So we can add Carlton, Lisa, to that group.

LISA PHIFER: Sure, we can take an action item to do that. So, I think the question is, looking at the list of members and rapporteurs, are there any adjustments that need to be made here? Do we need to add resources to any group for the groups where the rapporteurs don't have the bandwidth to pay attention as you might like right now? Is there another member of the sub group who wants to pitch in and get things rolling?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: And I did add this -- go ahead, Carlton.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'm sorry, Susan.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Please go ahead, do you have a comment?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Please continue. No, no, no. I'm withdrawing. Please continue.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, sorry about that. I did have a to-do for last week on drafting the anything new template, and the common interface, so although I do not want to unilaterally decide that I'm leading those subgroups, I will take a stab at drafting those templates this week and getting them out to the subgroups for comments and editing. Hopefully, we would get things moving forward.

I'll also, on the privacy proxy, answer all those questions that we've posed on the next steps. So hopefully to move that team forward a little bit more. I'll take those initiatives, I don't know if anybody else -- and thank you for volunteering, Carlton, on the other. Lili, you have your hand up.

LILI SUN: Yes. This is Lili for the record. I [inaudible] and I didn't find that we needed five people for this subgroup at this time, request for more additional resources for this subgroup.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, you're asking for more resources for the data accuracy group?

LILI SUN: Yes.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. So right now you have Cathrin, Dmitri, and --

LILI SUN: Cathrin and Dmitri, yes.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So are you thinking one or two more people would be better to have on this team?

LILI SUN: Yes. If the review team members are not available, maybe the ICANN implementation team, the ICANN staff also can help.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, let's think about that. Lisa, go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Yeah, if I might, so it is important because this is an independent review of how ICANN implemented each of these recommendations, that the sub group members actually be review team members. ICANN staff is of course available to help. Subject matter experts can be brought in to help answer the questions posed by the review team, but the review team members should be the members of the subgroup.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, so what we can do, Lily, is put out a call for volunteers to the whole review team, and see what additional members would be willing to join that group, but I can also commit some level of assistance there, and we can talk to Alan and see if he could also weigh in on that review subgroup.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Susan, can I say something?

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, Carlton, go ahead.

CARLTON SAMUELS: This is Carlton. Thank you, Susan. It would good to know in one place where we think we are light on the subgroups and offer it. I noticed that we have the privacy proxy subteam as well as the data accuracy partner that Lili is speaking about. Those are two pieces that is quite intensive reporting work. Especially reading reports with the voluminous amount of reporting that is available on those two issues.

I could go either one, depending on where the greater need is, but it would be good if we could just -- for everybody's good, this kind of outline, which ones we think we're light on in terms of membership interaction, and then invite the memberships. Thank you.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I would agree, and I thank you for agreeing to step forward for one of those, so let's put it out to the review team and see if anybody else volunteers. I'm not indicated on the privacy proxy, but we do have four of us really working on that, so it could be the data accuracy would be the key one for right now.

Let's put out a call for data accuracy specifically, but also if there are others that are interested in joining other groups, like Carlton had stepped forward for consumer trust, then we could get more people engaged on each one. Lisa, your hand's up.

LISA PHIFER: Yes, thanks. I wonder if we set a target of maybe this Friday, but set a target for any rapporteur that believes their subgroup needs additional resources to raise that to the full team in advance to Friday's call.

And then in Friday's call, perhaps we could solidify any additions because it's probably not helpful for the whole team to be on every subgroup but to really identify first where the gaps are, and then have those of you willing to volunteer for something addition spread out across to fill those gaps.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: I agree with that. That makes a lot more sense. So let's go ahead and do that if we can -- I see they're typing in some notes. We can send out an email today and then make a decision on it on Friday.

Okay, is there anything else on reviewing the subgroup membership?

LISA PHIFER: I think that's it for today. I think the most important point is that since we're moving from planning our work to executing, if we need to make adjustments to the subgroups, now is probably the right time to do that so that the subgroups that have been assigned really can buckle down and begin to dig through the work as a group.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Yes, I would agree with that completely. We'll try to get the subgroups the resources they need by Friday, and hopefully, the subgroups will also answer all of the next step questions, which can get us moving.

Alright, that was a good discussion. So, let's go to ICANN62. Okay, and I'm blanking out on what we're discussing here, so either Alice or Jean-Baptiste, did you have input on this?

ALICE JANSEN: Yes Susan, this is Alice. So, on Friday's Plenary call, we flagged for you the deadlines that we have internally for all the bidding requests to be submitted for Panama, the ICANN62 meeting.

So for the work plan, we do have a meeting mapped out for this particular window of time, and we'd like to confirm the group whether you wish to proceed with the face to face meeting and engage in sessions. This is still up for discussion and I think the discussion was meant to happen today. Hope that clarifies.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Right, thank you. So, this would be another face to face meeting for the review. This is a question actually. We would actually meet at ICANN62 and have a working session, but also do community outreach? Is that what we intended?

ALICE JANSEN: Correct, yes.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That was the approach.

ALICE JANSEN: Although Alan seemed to indicate on Friday, I believe, that it may be difficult to schedule a two day meeting with all the meetings happening at the same time, but this was the group discussion.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That's right, a two day meeting. I'm more concerned that we will actually have something for the community to comment on by then, so if we meet in April face to face, do you think that we will have draft recommendation to the community before the ICANN62? Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks. I just want to point out that it's not actually necessary to present recommendations to the community in order to have an outreach because you don't have an engagement session in Puerto Rico.

You actually won't have engaged the community in even looking at the objectives that you're working on, so the starting points of the engagement session of course would be sharing your objectives and then, anything that you feel comfortable sharing with respect to the facts that you have found and the starting points of your recommendations.

I guess my point is, there may be plenty to share with the community in an engagement session, short of recommendations that you feel are pretty sound by the middle of June.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Can I just ask to what Lisa is saying. I'm pretty sure that you are right. The issue for Alan was because he and others, [inaudible] specifically, we usually are engaging in front loaded meetings before the official start of the ICANN meeting. It would have been difficult to me, but that does not stop others who are surrogates to have engagement sessions with the various community groups to do exactly what Lisa says; kind of give them a heads up on where we're going with this, what kind of issues we are going to look at, and so, we have lots of those that would've emerged by then.

So we did agree that at least if there was a [inaudible] agreement, that there would be a face to face. The question was whether or not we could schedule a two day face to face, that would have been kind of

[inaudible] on into the agenda before the official start of the ICANN meeting. And everybody on the team would be available for.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: So, we're a definite then, I think, in agreement on the engagement session during ICANN62, but it's up for discussion as to the face to face meeting. That would put us the 23rd and 24th in Panama. And is that even possible, Alice?

ALICE JANSEN: I will do some investigations on that.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. And would anybody prefer not to meet prior to ICANN62? Does anybody have any feelings about that or inability to meet then? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay. I think we should put the possibility of having a face to face connected to the ICANN62 meeting out in an email to the whole review team because some of us were on Friday's call and some of us are on today's call, so just for continuity.

But then we should agree we definitely have the engagement session. Is there a meeting request we'll need to do, Alice, to ensure we'll have the engagement session?

ALICE JANSEN: We'll take care of that for you. We'll get back to you on this topic once we get a chance to talk to our colleagues. We'll get back to you on this.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, perfect. So was there any other decision that you needed from us today on this at all, on ICANN62?

ALICE JANSEN: No, this is great. It's a good head start. Thank you so much.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, thanks Alice. Alright. I do not know what the agenda will be for -- well, we've added several agenda items for Friday, or deadlines for Friday, so maybe Jean-Baptiste, if you could go over the few items that we've decided that we need a decision on or Friday or report from the different subgroups?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So, by Friday, each rapporteur should have identified the need for additional resources and subgroup members. On the compliance subgroup as I had mentioned, [inaudible] the next step with subgroup members.

On the law enforcement subgroup, Cathrin spoke about the survey, and will finish up any potential questions for the survey, and all subgroups should come back -- but that's later on, that [inaudible] for this Friday. Other than that, I don't have any other items.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay. That works. And do we have any AOB, any other business that someone would like to bring up today? [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay. Lisa, was there anything else we should talk about?

LISA PHIFER: I think just have Jean-Baptiste review today's action items, and that might prompt anything else that needs to be covered before we conclude.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, Jean-Baptiste.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay. So [inaudible] compliance subgroups, so [inaudible] next step with subgroup members. [Inaudible] subgroup to flesh out potential questions for [inaudible] survey; subgroups to come up with a plan an answers to roadmap questions by the 19th of February, and emails to go out to deliver the team with questions on next steps [inaudible] slide deck as work plan [inaudible] details.

Add Carlton to consumer trust subgroup and subgroup mailing list, and report [inaudible] by Friday the 9th of February, the next plenary call with the additional subgroup members. And also we have noted your request for the possibility of a face to face meeting on the 23rd or 24th of June, and that's it.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, we actually got through quite a bit here today. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: Thanks, Susan. I wonder if you might want to identify a subgroup to drill into Friday's call if time permits.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: That would be great. I'd ask Volker to email whether or not we could do that on privacy proxy, and are there any other suggestions? Maybe data accessing? That might be a help to Lili. Lisa, please go ahead.

LISA PHIFER: I wonder if we might want to pick one of the two groups that hasn't really started their work plan. A common interface comes to mind.

SUSAN KAWAGUCHI: Okay, let's do that. That's a good idea. I'll provide a draft template, but as usual, anybody thoughts or ideas is always helpful, so it'd be good to drill in on Friday on that one. [AUDIO BREAK]

Alright. Any other comments or concerns? [AUDIO BREAK]

I'll give you back 15 minutes of your day. And thanks for all the good discussion today. I think we did move the ball forward a little bit, and I

think that'll get us running smoother on our work. So, have a good day, or evening, and we'll talk on Friday.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you all, take care.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]